

## REMARKS

By this amendment, Applicants have amended claims 1-4 and 7-8 and cancelled claim 6. As a result, claims 1-4 and 7-8 are pending in this application. These amendments are being made to facilitate early allowance of the presently claimed subject matter. Applicants do not acquiesce in the correctness of the objections and rejections and reserve the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of the original claims, or claims that are potentially broader in scope, in the current and/or a related patent application. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, the Office rejects claims 4, 6 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. In particular, the Office alleges that claim 4 is directed towards a system, however the claim allegedly does not recite any physical hardware elements. Without conceding this rejection, Applicants have amended claim 4. As aptly depicted in FIG. 1, client server is located on a physical computing device. Further, paragraph [0016] of the originally filed specification includes “a machine”. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Office withdraw this rejection.

Further, the Office rejects claims 1-4 and 6-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Butterworth et al. (US 2004/0133656 A1), hereinafter “Butterworth,” in view of Lewontin (US 2005/0071419 A1), hereinafter “Lewontin,” and Hickman (US 2005/0198188 A1), hereinafter “Hickman”. Applicants submit that the Office fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

For example, with respect to claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that the Office fails, *inter alia*, to show that the proposed combination of Butterworth, Lewontin, and Hickman teach or suggest “checking, using a checker on the client server, for the redirection in the header of the message” as claimed therein.

In support of the rejection, the Office points to paragraph [0058] of Butterworth and paragraph [0044] of Lewontin. See Office Action, page 4. Paragraph [0058] of Butterworth teaches “redirect[ing] the request to an alternate web service” and paragraph [0044] of Lewontin teaches that “the OTA Push address may be included in protocol headers (e.g., HTTP headers) of requests.” However, Applicants assert that neither Butterworth nor Lewontin teach or suggest checking, using a checker on the client server, for the redirection in the header of the message. Further, Applicants contend that Hickman fails to remedy this deficiency of Butterworth and Lewontin.

In light of the above, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections of claim 1, and claims 2-3 and 7, which depend therefrom, as allegedly being unpatentable over the proposed combination of Butterworth, Lewontin, and Hickman.

With respect to claim 4, Applicants submit that the Office fails, *inter alia*, to show that the proposed combination of Butterworth, Lewontin, and Hickman teaches or suggests a system for redirecting a request for a web service in a data transmission network that includes all the features claimed therein. For example, for reasons that should be clear from the discussion of the proposed combination of Butterworth, Lewontin, and Hickman above, Applicants submit

that the proposed combination of Butterworth, Lewontin, and Hickman fails to teach or suggest the system of claim 4, including “wherein the checker of the client server is adapted to check whether said SOAP response message contains the new point address by checking for the redirection in the header of the SOAP response message” as claimed therein. As a result, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections of claim 4 and claim 8, which depend therefrom, as allegedly being unpatentable over the proposed combination of Butterworth, Lewontin, and Hickman.

Applicants submit that each of the pending claims is patentable for one or more additional unique features. To this extent, Applicants do not acquiesce to the Office’s interpretation of the claimed subject matter or the references used in rejecting the claimed subject matter. Additionally, Applicants do not acquiesce to the Office’s combinations and modifications of the various references or the motives cited for such combinations and modifications. These features and the appropriateness of the Office’s combinations and modifications have not been separately addressed herein for brevity. However, Applicants reserve the right to present such arguments in a later response should one be necessary and/or in a related patent application, either of which may seek to obtain protection for claims of a potentially broader scope.

If the Examiner believes that anything further is necessary to place the application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/ Elaine Chi /

Dated: December 14, 2010

Elaine Chi  
Reg. No. 61,194

Hoffman Warnick LLC  
75 State Street, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Albany, NY 12207  
(518) 449-0044 - Telephone  
(518) 449-0047 - Facsimile